

REMARKS

The Office action of November 26, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 19-21, 23, and 25 have been amended.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 19, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. ("Correa") (U.S. Patent No. 6,241,398). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski, Jr. ("Sikorski") (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,876). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Terada et al. ("Terada") (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114593 A1). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa. Claims 9-10, 12-13, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request allowance thereof in the continuation prosecution application for the following reasons.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 19, and 21-26 are not anticipated by Correa

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 19, and 21-26 stand rejected under § 102(b) in view of Correa. Applicants strongly contend that Correa fails to disclose the features recited in these claims as amended such as a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Correa does not disclose this patentably distinct feature of a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide. In direct contrast to the claimed invention, Correa solely discloses using a conductive nut 24, including internal threads, that helps provide a conductive path along with a tubular member 30 from an optical fiber 20 to a connector 10 in a faceplate 14. (see FIGs. 1, 2; col. 2, lines 31-58). As disclosed by Correa, the conductive nut serves partially as a portion of the conductive path, but mostly as a nut to secure the connector 10 (which engages the optical fiber connector termination 22) to the faceplate 14.

Specifically, Correa states that "...the securement nut holding the connector to the faceplate...a conductive nut 24 is provided to

secure the connector 10 to the faceplate 14...the nut 24 has internal threads for engaging the threads 18 of the connector 10...the nut 24 is used to secure the connector 10 to the faceplate 14..." (see FIGs. 1-2; Abstract; col. 2, lines 31-39). Therefore, clearly, conductive nut 24 includes internal threads to secure the connector 10 (which engages the optical fiber connector termination 22) to the faceplate 14.

Therefore, Correa directly opposes the claimed invention by actually disclosing an extension (the conductive nut 24) that includes internal threads (a threaded interior surface) which contrasts from the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate. Applicants strongly contend that Correa's disclosure of a conductive nut 24 having an internal threads for connecting the connector 10 to conductive faceplate 14 while partially serving as part of a conductive path is significantly different than a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from said conductive faceplate as recited in the claims.

Therefore, it is clear that Correa does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 3 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 3 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim as amended such as a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing a conductive nut extension that must necessarily include internal threads to connect the faceplate 14 with a connector 10 which contrasts with a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate as recited.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is a significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive

faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, both Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited references.

Claim 6 is not made obvious by Correa and Terada

Claim 6 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Terada. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim as amended such as a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing a conductive nut extension that must necessarily include internal threads to connect the faceplate 14 with a connector 10 which contrasts with a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate as recited.

Similarly, Terada does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate.

Terada solely discloses a laser diode module including a laser diode, lens, and optical fiber (see FIG. 1; paragraph 10). Clearly, there is a significant difference between Terada's laser diode module and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the laser diode module does not function as a faceplate extension to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited. Therefore, both Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 7 is not made obvious by Correa

Claim 7 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa. Applicants strongly contend that Correa fails to disclose the features recited in these claims such as a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of

the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide rather than a faceplate extension forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited.

Therefore, Correa does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claims 9-10, 12-13, 16-18, and 20 are not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claims 9-10, 12-13, 16-18, and 20 stand rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing

a conductive nut extension that must necessarily include internal threads to connect the faceplate 14 with a connector 10 which contrasts with a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate as recited.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is a significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, from around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 11 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 11 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing a conductive nut extension that must necessarily include internal threads to connect the faceplate 14 with a connector 10 which contrasts with a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate as recited.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is

significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct, and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 14 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 14 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. It is noted that perhaps a typographical error has occurred in the Action since Terada was cited before in the Action to allegedly disclose the use of an aluminum alloy for the faceplate and faceplate extension as recited in claim 6. It is assumed that Terada was meant to be cited as well for claim 14 to allegedly disclose this feature.

Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one

of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing a conductive nut extension that must necessarily include internal threads to connect the faceplate 14 with a connector 10 which contrasts with a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate as recited.

Similarly, Terada does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Terada solely discloses a laser diode module including a laser diode, lens, and optical fiber (see FIG. 1; paragraph 10). Clearly, there is a significant difference between Terada's laser diode module and the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the laser diode module does not function as a faceplate extension to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited. Therefore, both Correa and Terada, either

alone or in combination, do not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 15 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 15 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing a conductive nut extension that must necessarily include internal threads to connect the faceplate 14 with a connector 10 which contrasts with a faceplate extension projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate as recited.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of each faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate,

around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is a significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, projecting and having an unthreaded interior surface extending outwardly from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the remaining claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees

required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH, & BIRCH, LLP

by 
Michael R. Cammarata, Reg. #39,491

MRC/CAG:tm
4450-0398P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
Phone: (703) 205-8000